

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
9 AT SEATTLE

10 ADVANCED HAIR RESTORATION, LLC,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 HAIR RESTORATION CENTERS, LLC,

14 Defendant.  
15

Case No. C17-709RSM

ORDER DECLINING TO ENTER  
STIPULATION

16 This matter comes before the Court on the parties' Stipulated Motion for Entry and  
17 Modification of Case Scheduling Order. Dkt. #30. The parties submit that good cause exists  
18 for a two-month extension of pretrial deadlines because they "have been pursuing discovery but  
19 remain in the middle of a discovery dispute that has persisted since October 2017," because  
20 they have "attempted to engage in settlement negotiations," and because "it is not realistic for  
21 the parties to complete discovery, resolve their disputes, and prepare for trial under the existing  
22 case schedule." *Id.*  
23

24 Current deadlines in this case are as follows:

Deadline for filing motions related to discovery	March 30, 2018
Discovery completed by	April 30, 2018
Jury Trial Date	August 27, 2018

25  
26  
27  
28 Dkt. #13.

1 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4) states that a schedule may be modified only  
2 for good cause and with the judge's consent. This Court's Local Rules state:

3  
4 The parties are bound by the dates specified in the scheduling  
5 order. A schedule may be modified only for good cause and with  
6 the judge's consent. Mere failure to complete discovery within the  
7 time allowed does not constitute good cause for an extension or  
8 continuance.

9 LCR 16(b)(5).

10 The Court has reviewed this Stipulation and the remainder of the record, and finds the  
11 parties have failed to set forth a good cause basis for modifying the Scheduling Order as  
12 required under Rule 16(b)(4). The existing discovery deadline is two months away. The  
13 parties have failed to present sufficient evidence to convince the Court that the discovery issues  
14 in this case, either in collecting discovery or resolving disputes related to discovery, cannot be  
15 resolved within that time frame. Even if the parties could present such evidence, it would not  
16 satisfy Local Rule 16. The parties have not adequately informed the Court of significant  
17 scheduling issues not related to discovery. Attempting to engage in settlement negotiations is  
18 expected of parties and does not alone constitute good cause to modify a schedule.

19 Given all of the above, the Court DECLINES to enter the parties' Stipulation, Dkt. #30.  
20 The Court urges the parties to attempt to resolve their discovery issues within the existing  
21 deadlines.  
22

23 DATED this 28 day of February, 2018.

24  
25 

26 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ  
27 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
28